

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
SPARTANBURG DIVISION

Stacy Danell Woodruff, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. ) Civil Action No. 7:18-1920-BHH  
 )  
 )  
 Spartanburg City Police Department, ) **ORDER**  
 Spartanburg Herald Journal, )  
 Spartanburg County Detention Center, )  
 Nikerra Pearson-Byrd, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On July 30, 2018, Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin issued a report and recommendation (“Report”) outlining Plaintiff’s claims and recommending that the Court dismiss this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. In her Report, Magistrate Judge Austin determined that Plaintiff’s claims are subject to dismissal based on the *Younger* abstention doctrine based on the pending criminal charges against Plaintiff; that abstention is also appropriate under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 487 (1994); that Plaintiff’s complaint fails to state a claim for defamation; and that Plaintiff has failed to name a Defendant amenable to suit under § 1983.

Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To

date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 9), and the Court dismisses this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

August 22, 2018  
Charleston, South Carolina

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge